HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

NATIONAL·AMERICAN·WOMAN·SUFFRAGE·ASSOCIATION

171 . MADISON · AVE. NEW · YORK · CITY

VOLUME II NUMBER III

MARCH · 15 · 1916

MRS. ERNEST THOMPSON SETON
Chairman of the Suffrage Poster Contest Committee

JAN 30 1917

HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

A printed attempt to maintain intimate contact between the National American Woman Suffrage Association and its thousands of members throughout the country.

Published once a month by the National American Woman Suffrage Association, at 171 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Subscription price per year 25c.

Entered as second class matter Oct, 6, 1915, at Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

—:o:—

National American Woman Suffrage Association

Honorary President
DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

President
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

1st Vice-President
MRS. FRANK M. ROESSING

2nd Vice President
MRS. STANLEY MCCORMICK

3rd Vice-President
MISS ESTHER G. OGDEN

Recording Secretary
MRS. JAMES W. MORRISSON

Corresponding Secretary
MISS HANNAH J. PATTERSON

Treasurer
MRS. HENRY WADE ROGERS

1st Auditor
MRS. WALTER MCNAB MILLER

2nd Auditor
MRS. PATTIE RUFFNER JACOBS

Congressional Committee

Headquarters:
Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

—:o:—

A NEW DEPARTMENT

Early in January, questionnaires were sent to all the State Presidents requesting information concerning the extent and character of organization, number of organizers employed, and plans for the forward work. The information obtained from these questionnaires amplified by correspondence with the various states and a visit to several, have revealed the fact that organization in few states is being pushed as the status of our movement in the year 1916 demands. It should be remembered by every State Board that no referendum can be successful in a state which has an inadequate organization to prepare its campaign. No bill providing for partial suffrage can be expected to go through a Legislature which is not backed by an organized constituency in every Assembly District in the state. The Federal Amendment, when it comes from Congress, must be ratified by 36 states, and to secure this result there must be education and organization in every state in the Union. The National Board desires to help the states in every way possible. To this end we advise and urge that every state which has not already done so shall transform its plan of organization into that which makes the political unit the basis of organization.

Beginning with the next issue of the News Letter we will open a Department on Organization. We shall attempt to give lessons in organization along these new and more efficient lines. As many states have passed beyond the first stages the early lessons may not prove helpful to all. Therefore in order to give assistance where needed, we shall stand prepared to answer questions through the News Letter and to attempt to give advice toward the solution of organization problems.

One phase of work which has accompanied the political unit of organization is the canvass. The object of making a canvass as well as the method of doing it have been much misunderstood in different states. We therefore invite workers in any state who have problems of organization to present them to the News Letter. If the advice we are able to give is not helpful, the discussion of the problem may open the way to advice for some one in our ranks who will be able to point the correct solution. It must never be forgotten by any suffragist that there is no easy, short cut to the vote. It must be won on the final test by organization.

Behind every Congressman there must be an organized demand for the submission of the Federal Amendment, if we are to be enfranchised by that method, and behind every member of each one of the 48 legislatures there must be an organized demand to secure the ratification of that amendment when submitted.

No State Association should consider that it is doing forward work or contributing its part to the big national campaign which does not increase its organized membership and influence every year.

To mobilize a suffrage army commensurate in size to the big drive ahead and to train it to the highest efficiency should be the aim of every suffrage organization.

CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT.

—:o:—

PRIZE CONTESTS

Two nation-wide suffrage contests, with prizes to the amount of $525, will open on April 1, under the auspices of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, and a special committee headed by Mrs. Grace Thompson Seton. Five hundred dollars of this amount is to be paid in ten prizes for art posters which may be used for suffrage advertising in window and bill board display. Twenty-five dollars will be given for the best new suffrage slogan.

These contests are the first of this type the National has ever held, and in order to get the best possible results from them, every suffragist in the country must do her share toward getting the right material before the judges. If you cannot design posters or originate a catchy suffrage phrase, you can fulfil your obligation by urging your friends to compete. Every poster artist in the United States, whether celebrated or not, ought to be represented in the poster contest. The judges are to be distinguished artists and magazine editors whose critical opinion will insure careful treatment of all work submitted.

The National is conducting this contest because it has found from past experience that posters and bill boards are the most effective form of "passerby" propaganda that can be used. A picture is always a quick means of telling a story or making a point and it is as true of suffrage as it is of anything else. Do your share toward making this contest the biggest one the poster world has ever known.

The terms of the poster competition, which opens April 1 and closes October 1, are as follows:

(1.) All posters awarded prizes or honorable mention are to become the property of the N. A. W. S. A. without further compensation to the designer.

(2.) The Committee reserves the right to retain any design submitted until January 1, and to exhibit the same at the next Annual Convention of the N. A. W. S. A. in December without cost or compensation to the artist.

(3.) Designs in black and white may be submitted, but designs in color are preferred.

(4.) The area of the design shall not be less than two square feet or more than ten square feet.

(5.) Design must have at least one-third its area left blank for informational printing (such as time, place of meeting, speakers, topics etc.) The blank area may be broken by the design.

(6.) Yellow should be introduced into the design but need not dominate.

(7.) A design will be judged:

a. For popular appeal,
b. For maximim of effect and minimum of expense to reproduce,
c. For the story it tells in a few broad lines,
d. For pleasing color scheme, using not more than three colors.

$500 TO BE DISTRIBUTED IN PRIZES.

First prize, $250.
Second prize, $100.
Third prize, $50.
Two Honorable Mention, $25 each.
Five Honorable Mention, $10 each.

(8.) Competition open to all, and number of sketches submitted by one person not limited. Competitors will deliver designs and pay for their removal if desired.

(9.) Address all communications and send designs to N. A. W. S. A. Headquarters, 171 Madison Avenue, New York City, Grace Thompson Seton, Chairman Art Publicity.

The slogan contest is also very important. A good phrase that people will quote and paraphrase is a splendid means of keeping suffrage before the mind of the person who might otherwise forget it now and then, and we want this new prize slogan to be on everybody's lips. The poster contest is necessarily confined to the field of artists, but anyone can think of a phrase. Have it on your mind while you're doing other things and get your family and friends interested. Following are the rules of the slogan competition which is open from April 1 to October 1:

(1.) Old slogans will not be considered.

(2.) Slogans must not contain more than five words.

(3.) Write your slogan on the outside of a small envelope. Place your name and address *inside* that same envelope and seal it. Then place the envelope inside another envelope and mail it to the Slogan Committee, N. A. W. S. A Headquarters, 171 Madison Avenue, New York City.

(4.) Competition open to all, and number of slogans sumbitted by one person not limited.

Prize for best slogan, $25.

Judges to be announced later.

Send a Slogan!

PROGRESS OF THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY AMENDMENT

KNOWN IN THE

64TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AS

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Conferring upon Women the Right of Suffrage.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several states as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

History of Amendment.

First introduced in the Senate, January 10, 1878 by Senator A. A. Sargent, of California.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

In the Senate:

1878, Adverse majority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1889, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1890, Without recommendation.
1893, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Without recommendation.
1913, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.
1916, Favorable majority.

VOTED UPON IN THE SENATE:

January 25, 1887, yeas 16, nays 34.
March 19, 1914, yeas 35, nays 34.

IN THE HOUSE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.

VOTED UPON IN THE HOUSE,

January 12,1915; yeas 174, nays 204.

Introduced in the 64th Congress

IN THE SENATE,

December 7, 1915, by Senator Sutherland, of Utah, Senator Thomas, of Colorado, and Senator Thompson, of Kansas.
Referred in the Senate to Committee on Woman Suffrage.
Reported in the Senate on January 8, with a favorable recommendation.

IN THE HOUSE,

December 6, 1915, by Representatives Raker, Mondell, Keating, Taylor and Hayden.
Referred in the House to the Judiciary Committee, and by it to its sub-committee No. 1.
Reported to the Judiciary Committee by the sub-committee on February 15, 1916, with recommendation that the Judiciary Committee report it to the House without recommendation. By a vote of 9 to 7 on February 15, the Judiciary Committee returned the amendment to sub-committee No. 1 with instructions to hold until December 14. On March 14, the Judiciary Committee by unanimous consent agreed to take final Committee action on the amendment on March 28.

Status:

IN THE SENATE,

On the calendar awaiting action.

IN THE HOUSE,

In the Judiciary Committee.

THE CONGRESSIONAL SITUATION.

Although there has been no change in the official status of the Susan B. Anthony amendment since February 15th, when the Judiciary Committee of the House by a vote of 9 to 7 referred the Raker Resolution back to its sub-committee No. 1, to be held until December 14th, there is reason to believe that the measure will be reported out of committee soon.

Meanwhile so many inaccurate and conflicting reports have been circulated concerning the original action of the House Committee in attempting to shelve our bill on February 15th that a brief review of the events associated with that attempt seems in order. What the Committee actually did that day was to agree by a vote of 9 to 7 to refer the Raker Resolution back to Sub-Committee Number 1 to be held until December 14th.

The vote itself was not much of a surprise to us, as, prior to the meeting of the Judiciary Committee our lobby discovered that four of our supporters would not be able to attend, because of illness or for other reasons, and that we would not have strength enough in the committee to get the action we desired. Moreover, it was evident that, if it chose, the opposition could defeat us. Our lobby therefore asked Representative Nelson to take charge of our measure for the day in the Committee, and advised him that in case the opposition had strength enough and were inclined to give us adverse action, he should move merely to "continue" the measure. In this way we hoped to save it.

The situation developed as expected, whereupon Mr. Nelson made his motion. The opposition offered an amendment by calling for definite postponement until December 14. Of course our friends voted against this amendment, since the National distinctly did not wish such delay, but the opposition had the votes and carried it 9 to 7, as before stated.

A false report has been circulated in some places to the effect that the National approved the action of this Committee in postponing a report until next December. That is, of course, untrue. All that the National did approve in the Committee's action is that it was better to have postponement than decisive adverse action. In other words, when we saw that we could not carry in the Committee we consented to action which would save the measure, rather than have it defeated.

Those who voted in favor of postponement to December were:

Whaley, of South Carolina; Webb, of North Carolina; Carlin, of Virginia; Walker, of Georgia (substituted on the Committee for Mr. Dupré, of Louisiana); Igoe, of Missouri; Gard, of Ohio; Williams, of Illinois; Steele, of Pennsylvania; Caraway, of Arkansas.

All are Democrats.

Those who voted against such postponement were:

Taggart, of Kansas; Volstead, of Minnesota; Nelson, of Wisconsin; Chandler, of New York; Thomas, of Kentucky; Dale, of New York; Graham, of Pennsylvania.

Three are Democrats: four are Republicans.

Those who were absent are:

Moss, of West Virginia; Neely, of West Virginia; Dyer, of Missouri; Morgan, of Oklahoma; Danforth, of New York.

The Congressional Committee immediately set to work to secure reconsideration of this action by the Committee. When our lobby interviewed Mr. Webb, he announced that at the same meeting at which the Committee voted for postponement to December 14th, Mr. Whaley, of South Carolina, made a motion to reconsider and table. Mr. Webb stated that not a voice was raised in objection to this motion, although he called the attention of the members to the fact that this motion was a "clincher" and would prevent any possible action on the suffrage amendment until December 14th. He stated that any motion to reconsider or to attempt any further action on our measure in his Committee would be ruled out of order. When other members of the Committee were interviewed they expressed great surprise about the tabling motion, several saying that they were quite certain that no such motion had been offered. Upon investigation, the Secretary of the Committee informed us that the minutes contained such a motion.

In the belief that a Committee is a deliberative body and that whenever the majority of any Committee desires to consider any matter in its jurisdiction it has the right to do so, your Congressional Committee continued to press for reconsideration.

A letter has been sent to every state giving the states correct information as to the situation, and asking that letters be sent to every member of the Judiciary Committee requesting reconsideration and a prompt report out of the Committee.

In the Senate the situation remains unchanged, the measure being on the calendar awaiting action.

Mrs. T. T. Cotnam, of Arkansas, one of our members, has joined the Committee at Washington, and is now assisting with the lobby work there. A meeting of the Congressional Committee was held in Washington on March 2, at which time Mrs. Funk, of Illinois, Mrs. Jacobs, of Alabama, Miss Norris, of Ohio, Mrs. Cotnam, of Arkansas, and the Chairman were present. The meeting lasted all day, a recess being taken at 5 o'clock until March 7, when the Committee had a final session.

MRS. FRANK M. ROESSING,
Chairman, Congressional Committee.

March 13, 1916.

—:o:—

On March 14th, the House Judiciary Committee reconsidered the Raker Resolution, and by unanimous consent agreed to take final Committee action on the amendment on March 28th.

In a letter to Mrs. Catt, written March 15th, Senator Charles S. Thomas of Colorado said: "Your organization is deserving of the warmest congratulations in being able to score such a signal success. I hope the Committee may see its way toward making a favorable report."

CONGRESSIONAL CONFERENCES.

As an inspiration for the kind of work that produces results, the Congressional Conferences now being held under the auspices of the National Association are exceeding even the fondest hopes of both National and State leaders. Up to date, ten of them have been held. New England staged six and Pennsylvania, New York, Illinois and Missouri, the remaining four.

In the six New England States, every congressional district sent representatives to the conferences. The meetings were not only crowded but the response of the women to the National's appeal to take up federal work was both wonderful and heartening. Some conception of the enthusiasm which these conferences are stirring up may be gleaned from the fact that following the New Hampshire conference at Manchester, more than $2,000 was raised within 24 hours to help finance the educational campaign which the New Hampshire suffragists are going to run this summer.

The fact that there are a number of States where the women can hope to secure the vote only through a federal amendment—owing to the rigidity of their State Constitutions—has done a great deal to increase interest in the federal campaign which the National is waging, especially in New England. In Maine, for instance, an amendment has to receive a two-thirds concurrent vote in both houses before it can go to a referendum. In Vermont, although an amendment requires only a majority vote in the House and a two-thirds vote in the Senate the first time it comes before the Legislature, it may not reach the people for ten years. This is due to the fact that the Constitution can be amended only once in ten years. An appreciation of these facts has stimulated interest in the federal amendment work among the New England women and they have pledged the heartiest kind of co-operation to the National's federal campaign.

Similar pledges have been made in all the States where the conferences have been held.

The conferences will be continued this month and through April in the West and Middle-West.

On March 20th and 21st, the Ohio suffragists will hold their congressional conference at Columbus. The Michigan conference will be staged at Detroit on March 22nd and 23rd; the Wisconsin conference at Milwaukee, on March 24th and 25th, and the Kentucky conference at Louisville, on March 27th and 28th.

Kentucky suffragists are making elaborate arrangements for their conference. Men's and women's clubs and federations all over the State are co-operating generously in the plans of the Kentucky Equal Rights Association.

The two days of conference are to be enlivened by addresses, luncheons, mass meetings and committee meetings. Among the thirty speakers will be Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, Mrs. Millie R. Trumbull, Secretary of the Child Labor Commission of the State of Oregon, the Rev. John Silli, of Louisville, Mrs. T. T. Cotnam, of Arkansas, Mrs. Desha Breckinridge, of Lexington, and Judge George DuRelle, of Louisville.

"WALKLESS PARADE" FOR ST. LOUIS.

Missouri's aggressive slogan—"Show Me!"—contains no terrors for the national suffrage hosts that will mobilize in St. Louis on June 14th. Not only will Missouri be "*shown*," but each and every delegate to the National Democratic Convention will secure some first-hand evidence that woman suffrage is one of the important issues of the day.

The scheme which the Missouri women have evolved to visualize for the democratic delegates the nation-wide demand for equal suffrage is both unique and spectacular. Literally, the demonstration will be a "walkless parade," with the action furnished by the sprightly costumes of the "paraders" and the snappy slogans on their banners. From the Hotel Jefferson, which will be the official headquarters of the Democratic delegates, to the Coliseum where the Convention will be held, double rows of suffragists with gay sashes and yellow parasols will stand on guard. A similar picturesque cordon will surround the Coliseum. Not a delegate will be able to enter or leave the Convention Hall without securing some optical evidence of the fact that American women *do* want the vote.

To assure the success of the demonstration, every state must be adequately represented, and it is especially urged that each congressional district have its representation. The yellow sashes will bear the name of the state and of the congressional district, so that no delegate need be in doubt as to the geographical identity of the suffragists.

During the day the guard will probably be maintained from 10 until 12 in the morning and from 2 until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. In the evening, the hour depending upon the program of the Convention and to be announced later, there will be twelve platforms, probably automobiles, stationed within the suffrage area, and presided over by men and women from the twelve enfranchised states, who will address the crowds and delegates as they come and go. We should like to have 48 platforms, one for each state, and every state is invited and urged to take charge of one, but we must have at least twelve.

For the Walkless Parade a great deal will depend upon numbers and the rest on picturesque effect: those two things are the stuff that parades are made of, whether walkless or marching. It is therefore important that as many delegates as possible from as many states and districts as possible be on hand and that uniformity of dress be carried out. Women are expected to wear white costumes, using a white dress that they already have, and will then add such extra ornament as yellow armband, apron, hatband, badge, cap, or whatever may be desired. The yellow parasol is a necessary feature and may be secured in St. Louis if ordered in sufficient time.

The chairman of the Committee in St. Louis is Mrs. Morrison Fuller, The Buckingham, St. Louis, Mo. Advise her of what your state and district are going to do at the Convention and what she may expect of you. If you expect to stay over night in St. Louis watch the Committees on Arrangements and Hospitality for notice of rates and accomodations.

THE DATA DEPARTMENT.

(In so far as possible an effort is made in this department to present facts without interpreting them, for suffrage speakers and others to use as they see fit. Where figures, lists of states, etc., would clog the narrative, they will be put in footnotes, so that the backing for each statement shall not be lacking.—MARY SUMNER BOYD.)

LESS EXTRAVAGANT ELECTIONS *vs.* LESS VOTERS.

Among the irrelevancies imported by the anti-suffragists into the discussion of woman suffrage is the objection that the increase of election expense will enormously increase the burden of taxation. The argument would, if true, as the *New York World* points out, prove more than the antis desire—or more than they would care to stand by openly—for it would prove all popular suffrage a waste of money. But the criticism is in reality used for more than it is worth.

The anti-suffragists try to impress election expenses by naming enormous lump sums. They tell of a million and a half for the election of 1914 in Pennsylvania, without putting the expense on the basis of 20 cents per capita, or stating its relation to other state or city expenditures.

In reality election expenditures are among the small items in a budget. In the 1914 budget of New York the total was between seven and eight tenths of one per cent. of the total expenditures for the city; in Chicago with the women voting it was a little over one per cent.

The Empire State Campaign Committee this winter published statements of governors of woman suffrage states to the effect that woman suffrage had not caused an undue increase in election expenses. Most of these officials appeared to consider the question a silly one and did not trouble to give figures in their replies. For this reason the Data Department sent out inquiries to various election officials in equal suffrage states, and received replies in regard to elections in Chicago and San Francisco before and after woman suffrage.

Figures for San Francisco show in 1911 (men voting) a per capita cost of 52 cents; the women's first vote in 1912 raised the cost only to 57 cents; to 70 cents in 1913 and down again to 57 cents in 1914. In 1915 the cost was 42½ cents, actually lower than before women voted.

The San Francisco figures are not explained, but their apparent irrationality carries the suggestion that there are many other elements besides the number of voters to be considered in connection with the cost of elections.

Much more is to be gained from Chicago. For many years before woman suffrage, the growing cost of elections had been recognized as a problem there, and the doubling of the electorate by the woman suffrage law was the occasion of a thorough investigation and report by the Board of Election Commissioners (1915).

The Clerk of Cook County, Illinois, estimated in his statement to the Empire State Campaign Committee that the vote of women had increased election expenses about a third. Per capita figures for election expenses in the three years preceding the woman suffrage law, given in the Chicago report, are: 1911, 23 cents; 1912, 40 cents; 1913, 17 cents; In 1914, the first year women voted, the cost was 47 cents. This, though a large sum, was only seven cents more than in the presidential year, two years before women voted. In 1915 the cost went down to 32 cents. In 1914 they had a re-organization of the election machinery in Chicago, which entailed an election expense they never had had before. The Chief Clerk of the Board of Elections contrasts the election activities in the presidential year with 1914, showing two elections, two primaries, two registrations, in the former year, three elections, three primaries, three registrations, revisions and canvasses in 1914. All this additional work cost heavily, and in view of this large outlay for matters unconnected with women's voting the expense of 32 cents in 1915 may be regarded as representing the normal cost of votes of men and women together. In comparing the male vote with the vote of both sexes, it is best to leave out of account the expensive presidential year, and take 1911, when the per capita cost was 23 cents. In equal suffrage 1915, it was 32 cents, less than fifty per cent. increase in per capita cost. The lump sum in 1911, this average year before woman suffrage, was $519,373.18; in 1915 the lump sum was $785,969.00, less than fifty per cent increase on lump as well as per capita cost.

The economical male vote of 1913 (17 cents) was not characteristic because for some reason unexplained in the report the vote in that year was, by many hundred thousand, the smallest polled in eight years.

There was in these Chicago equal suffrage elections, none of the "doubling," talked about by the antis, of any item of election expense, except the mere printing of ballots. The number of polling places, though in a crowded city where you would expect the previous polling places to have been used to capacity, was only increased 50%, and this is the next biggest item of increase, after the ballots.

In the presidential election of 1916 the report estimates that the women voters will cost less than $800,000 out of a total cost of that election of $2,500,000—so we come around again, in our 1916 figures, to the estimate of the clerk of Cook County of a total increase of one-third to be laid to the women voters.

But this is not all the story. It costs Chicago about a third more, at Chicago's rate of spending; but some cities without women voters are spending as much or more than Chicago. We are able from this report to compare Chicago with nine other large cities.* Three of these paid more per capita than Chicago, and only two paid more than a third less. Of the two that were very much under a third less than Chicago, Milwaukee is unique among the ten cities in the lowness of its cost; and Pittsburg had less election activities than Chicago in the year chosen.

San Francisco (42½ cents) stands at the very top, even ahead of St. Louis (38 cents), Although the man-suffrage city comes too near it to do any boasting, it would be easy to point to woman suffrage extravagance as the cause of San Francisco's large bill, if it were not for the fact that the figures already given for an election before woman suffrage show expenditures as great or greater. Elections at San Francisco appear, therefore, to cost heavily in part at least because of other causes than woman suffrage.

The comparison of Chicago with New York is particularly interesting. In a year in which New York had just the same election activities as Chicago, its election expenses cost 27 cents per capita as against 32 cents for Chicago, or, only five cents more.

New York had a population of 5,600,000, Chicago, 2,442,000; on the Chicago population the New York per capita would have been the enormous sum of 60 cents, and for this sum New York would have voted 944,826 persons, whereas for its 32 cents per capita Chicago votes 1,370,480 persons, the largest number of voters of any city in America.

The key to these differences lies in *cost per vote*—that is, in economy or extravagance in expenditures. New York votes, at the elections compared above, cost $1.60 a-piece; Chicago votes cost 57 cents a-piece. Milwaukee alone of the eight male suffrage cities cost less per vote than Chicago.

A small number of voters may be expensive out of all proportion; a body of voters that uses the election machinery to capacity may be cheap. Large scale production is cheap, small scale production expensive. The phenomenally small vote quoted at the Chicago election of 1913 though cheaper per capita, shows the greatest cost per vote in a ten-year period, and the election of 1915 shares with one other year over an eight year period, the smallest cost per vote.

The principle underlying all this is laid down by the Chicago Commissioners.

"It is customary in our day and age to weigh the value

---

*

City	*Cost per capita*	*Cost per vote*
NEW YORK CITY	27	$1.60
CLEVELAND	22	.97
OMAHA	22¼	.97
TOLEDO	34½	.93
PITTSBURG	17¼	.86
BOSTON	22	.75
ST. LOUIS	38	.60
SAN FRANCISCO	42½	.60
MILWAUKEE	13	.45
CHICAGO	32	.57

of any enterprise in dollars and cents. Sometimes this is a just determination of values—sometimes not."

"The distinction between just and unjust lies," say the commissioners, "in whether you test by this standard *cost of elections* which must be high in proportion to the democracy of the suffrage, and *cost of conducting* elections, which should always be reduced as far as possible."

This latter cost Chicago, faced by a sudden doubling of the electorate, is taking steps to cut. The election commissioners in co-operation with a committee of voting men and women, brought a bill before the last Illinois legislature which by cutting out extravagances, complexities and duplications in the methods of conducting elections, would have saved $1,000,000 in the elections of 1916. The legislature—*not*, be it remembered, elected by women! —failed to pass the bill.

Which is better, to save $800,000 by cutting out women voters next year or to save $1,000,000 by cutting out extravagance?

The commissioners give the answer, for they hold that to swell the expression of public opinion at the polls to the fullest possible volume is not a waste of money; that it is on the contrary "the duty of public officials and lawmakers and one of the foundation stones of American Civil Government."

It is this broad suffrage itself that has taught the Chicago Commissioners the necessity to cut out extravagance.

On the Board of Voting citizens who framed the law that would have established economy in elections in Chicago sat six women who had been largely instrumental in getting the suffrage law through.

We cannot help but reflect that a doubling of the electorate in any large city—say New York with its colossal extravagance in elections—which called in women's natural instincts for housekeeping economy to help devise such extensive plans for saving expense as those urged on the Illinois legislation, would show the woman voter not a money-waster but a real municipal housekeeper.

—:o:—

FINANCE

Contributions Received from February 1-29, 1916

GENERAL DONATIONS	
Mary Gray Peck	$ 13 63
A. M. Hillyer	1 00
	$ 14 63
CAMPAIGNS	
Mrs. C. C. Catt	$ 300 00
Nebraska W. S. Assoc.	100 00
Mrs. F. B. Ryce	5 00
Mrs. Robert G. Shaw	300 00
	$ 705 00
WASHINGTON PLEDGES	
Mrs. Abby Bartlett	$ 100 00
Mrs. Quincy A. Shaw	5,000 00
Mrs. F. H. Bethell	35 00
Mrs. L. S. Trowbridge	10 00
Mrs. Robert Gould Shaw	100 00
Mrs. James Bennett	110 00
C. M. Robinson	5 00
Zara Du Pont	$ 10 00
M. R. Patterson	5 00
Mrs. H. L. Patrick	25 00
Mrs. Fannie Harrison	200 00
Mrs. Ben Hooper	10 00
Mrs. Grace Thompson Seton	6 00
May V. Wolf	10 00
Mrs. Frank M. Roessing	10 00
Emily B. Stevenson	5 00
Mrs. J. P. Camerson	5 00
Katharine Hooker	10 00
Grace G. Green	10 00
Eq. Suffrage League of North Carolina	5 00
Mrs. FitzGerald	4 00
Mrs. E. Kidd (Pin Money Pickles)	15 00
	$ 5,690 00
Total	$ 6,409 63

—:o:—

NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

171 Madison Avenue, N. Y.

Please find enclosed 25 cents in stamps to cover the cost of one year's subscription to the Headquarters News Letter to be published once a month.

Name.....

Address.....

THE NUMBER OF WOMEN VOTERS

A controversy as to the number of women who may vote in the western states arose in the New York campaign. It began this way. Our opponents spread a statement broadcast that in New York 2,800,000 women would be enfranchised if our amendment was ratified at the polls, and that the admission of so large a number of new voters would vastly increase the cost of elections. Although the second claim was the chief appeal to the prejudice of New York, we challenged both statements justly and logically. Since the question has arisen again it may be well to give the readers of the News Letter the facts as we found them.

There were, in truth, in the State of New York, according to the Census of 1910, 2,800,000 "females over 21 years of age," but there were also 2,800,000 "males over 21 years of age," and yet the largest vote which has ever been cast in the State was 1,638,350, in 1908. We asserted that our opponents' figures told an untruth, since it was manifestly unfair to claim that a larger number of women than men would vote in proportion to their numbers. We declared that the number of women who might be considered as possible voters might safely be estimated from the average of the total male vote for several years. This, after adding a considerable number for good measure was 1,500,000, or little more than half the total number of "females over 21 years of age," as recorded in the Census.

Later our opponents challenged the statement made by suffragists that 4,000,000 of women vote in the enfranchised states.

Upon investigation we found that we had been guilty of drawing the same superficial conclusions from the census concerning the number of women who were possible voters in the West, as the Anti-suffragists had in relation to the number of women who would be possible voters in the State of New York. We found that the number of men in each state who actually vote, when compared with the number given in the Census as possessed of the age qualification, does not exceed three-fifths anywhere and fell in several instances below one-half.

For instance (confining our examples to the suffrage states) the men of Nevada in 1912 only cast about half the number of votes to which the age qualification would have entitled them; Arizona men cast much less than half, and Montana nearly half. There are so many factors missing that it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to why so large a number of men are continuously silent on Election Day. In New York, 1,000,000 men possessed of the age qualification have never expressed themselves on Election Day. Presumably, this astonishing number of silent men is not always composed of the same individuals, but the fact remains that the total number of men not voting remains fairly constant. In the number are included the unnaturalized, criminals in prisons, idiots, insane, and those who have not yet gained a residence in state, county or precinct, but the total of these classes cannot possibly equal the great number of men who go unrecorded on Election Day. We must conclude that there is in every state a very large number of men who voluntarily